

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on September 23, 2008. Applicants' counsel appreciates the courtesy extended by Examiner Dunwoody during the telephone interview conducted on January 5, 2009. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 as discussed during the interview to place claim 1, and claims 2-5 depending therefrom, in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments, as well as the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in complete condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the application in this regard.

During the telephone interview, Applicants' counsel and Examiner discussed amending independent claim 1 to recite that the cooperating locking structure includes at least one resilient portion associated with one of the stabilizing member and the nose to establish a snap-fit locking engagement of the stabilizing member with the nose. Support for this amendment is provided at Page 4, lines 10-15 of Applicants' disclosure, for example, and this feature is shown according to one embodiment in Figs. 3 and 4.

In the exemplary embodiment shown in Figs. 3 and 4, the stabilizing member (30) is provided with ears (36) that are appropriately configured and dimensioned for removable snap-fit insertion of the stabilizing member into the opening (14) and the distal end (12b) of nozzle (12).

As further discussed during the telephone interview, each of Smith and Pepicelli et al. taken alone, or in combination with the other prior art of record, is completely silent with respect to the combination of elements recited in amended independent claim 1, including cooperating locking structure that includes at least one resilient portion associated with one of a stabilizing member and a nose to establish a snap-fit locking engagement of the stabilizing member with the nose as recited in claim 1. Consequently, the Examiner's allowance of independent claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Moreover, as claims 2-5 depend from allowable independent claim 1, and further as each of these claims recites a combination of elements not fairly taught or suggested by the prior art of record, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable as well.

### **Conclusion**


In view of the foregoing response including the amendments and remarks, this application is submitted to be in complete condition for allowance and early notice to this affect is earnestly solicited. If there is any issue that remains which may be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to resolve the same and expedite the allowance of this application.

Application No. 10/784,385  
Amendment Dated 2/23/09  
Reply to Office Action of 9/23/08

Please see the electronic fee calculation sheet for the charge in the amount of \$490 for the two months extension fee as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(2). If any other fees are necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment or fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.



David H. Brinkman, Reg. No. 40,532

2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
(513) 241-2324 - Voice  
(513) 421-7269 - Facsimile